

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, and 26 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7, 9-19, 21-36, and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2002/0062435 A1 to Nemirovsky *et al.* (the "'435 application"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a loading mechanism for preloading data corresponding to the received data packet into the selected context for subsequent processing, the preloaded data including information from the data packet header." Applicants respectfully submit the '435 application neither teaches nor suggests at least the foregoing element recited in claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claims 2-5, 7, and 9-12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and add additional limitations thereto. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the

Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5, 7, and 9-12 set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Claim 13 recites, in part, "circuitry for computing input data into a value according to one or more logic rules and a mechanism for preloading data corresponding to a data packet received from the communication interface into available ones of a pool of contexts within the core, the preloaded data including at least a portion of a data packet header of the data packet." Applicants respectfully submit the '435 application neither teaches nor suggests at least the foregoing element recited in claim 13.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 13 set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claims 14-19 and 21-25 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 13 and add additional limitations thereto. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 14-19 and 21-25 set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Claim 26 recites, in part, "preloading data corresponding to the received data packet into the selected context for subsequent processing, the preloaded data including information from the data packet header." Applicants respectfully submit the '435 application neither teaches nor suggests at least the foregoing element recited in claim 26. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 26 set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claims 27-36 and 38-39 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 13 and add additional limitations thereto. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner

Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2008

MUSOLL, *et al.*
Appl. No. 09/881,628

reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 27-36 and 38-39 set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 8, 20, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '435 application in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,801 to Zisapel ("Zisapel"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and adds further limitation thereto. Claim 20 depends from claim 13 and adds further limitation thereto. Claim 37 depends from claim 26 and adds further limitation thereto. As described above, Applicants respectfully assert the '435 application does not disclose each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 26. Applicants respectfully submit Zisapel does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 20, and 37 set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 40-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '435 application in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/0210252 to Ludtke *et al.* ("Ludtke"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 40-41 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and add further limitation thereto. Claims 42-43 depend directly or indirectly from claim 13 and add further limitation thereto. Claim 44-45 depend directly or indirectly from claim 26 and add further limitation thereto. As described above, Applicants respectfully assert the

Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2008

MUSOLL, *et al.*
Appl. No. 09/881,628

'435 application does not disclose each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 26. Applicants respectfully submit Ludtke does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 40-45 set forth in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



David C. Isaacson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,500

Date: October 2, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

856230_1.DOC